

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 809

JC 920 293

AUTHOR Braman, Dave
TITLE Actualizing the Learning Community.
INSTITUTION Front Range Community Coll., Westminster, CO.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 11p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.)
(120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Administrators; *College
Planning; Community Colleges; *Continuing Education;
*Cooperative Planning; *Educational Cooperation;
Education Work Relationship; Institutional
Advancement; School Business Relationship; Two Year
Colleges

ABSTRACT

Where conditions are right, continuing education (CE) staff working in true collaboration with campus-based credit staff can meet the learning needs of the community and improve instructional quality with greater resource efficiency. CE staff must become learning strategists who bring ideas from their marketplace experience to the instructional planning processes of the institution. A CE office that lacks interest in fully representing both credit and non-credit options to the client is neither customer-responsive nor acting for the college as a whole. CE personnel have a unique and valuable capacity for environmental scanning, resource development, market research, and community outreach. If CE and credit staff think together, advances can be made in such areas as the actualization of the learning community, non-credit programming, general public credit outreach, community services, and occupational learning systems. Occupational clusters that adapt to today's demand will offer a continuum of learning services across the tech prep, job entry, and retraining markets. CE staff could become a major source for reporting workforce trends, for new program development, and for facilitating change in the institution to accommodate new industrial standards. CE administrators, no less than academic administrators, must become learning and institutional partnership leaders. (JMC)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED345809

Actualizing the Learning Community

Dave Braman

Dean of Continuing Education, Contract Services Division

Front Range Community College
Westminster, Colorado

1992

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Braman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) "

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy

Jc 920293

ACTUALIZING THE LEARNING COMMUNITY

Dave Braman
Dean of Continuing Education, Contract Services Division
Front Range Community College
Westminster, Colorado

In these times, partnerships formed by community colleges are considered wise and imperative business. Yet, one of the most results-effective partnerships that could be forged, right under the institutional nose, is largely overlooked. Where conditions are right, continuing education (CE) staff working in true collaboration with campus based credit staff will better meet the learning needs of the community, improve instructional quality and do so with greater resource efficiency. At many colleges, presidents could take the measure of institutional health, in large part, by examining if staff engaged in the delivery of these learning processes are organized for partnership.

The preparation of systems learners will be a fundamental charge of learning institutions to address the needs and practices of today's workplace. Colleges who do not themselves perform as systems will not do well at preparing systems thinkers. The community to college instruction connection is a critical link to forming the basis for wholistic learning. Staff who function in CE characteristic jobs must become learning strategists who can bring ideas from their marketplace experience to the instructional planning table of the institution. All staff must open their eyes to the relationships between applied training and general education, workplace and community literacy and developmental education, distant and classroom learning, instructional customizing processes, credit-non credit program articulation, CE style delivery alternatives, program currency and industry trends and outreach coordinating to meet the needs of the consumer learner. In most instances, staff are not oriented to understanding the relationships nor encouraged to bridge them.

The shared vision described by Peter Senge in his book "The Fifth Discipline", about learning organizations, starts with recognition by the external and internal agents of instruction that they have to think and act together to foster learning systems. Their

colleges in turn, must give them the security to share turf in order to place the needs of the learner above their historically divided interests. Presidents must understand the ecology of this, just as CEOs have understood the survival necessity of coordinating sales and manufacturing processes. Legislation may soon be on the national agenda to obligate education, social service agencies and business to perform as a seamless service system. The colleges that will be ready for seamless service must begin to remove the stitches between their campus and marketplace staff.

The force for change that can be exhibited by CE and business industry services (BIS) is dramatically represented in Lee Teitels Summer 1991, Community College Review article, "The Transformation of a Community College".(2) The results described in that case study occurred under conditions of institutional decline and upheaval, and were not organized as an over all institutional process. Most presidents would not want to face those conditions before trying to replicate the experiment. Rather, the revitalization of their college may rest with recognition that external and internal staff must team up. It is the job of management to organize the incentives, structure and the staff learning climate to support that.

College presidents who confine their identification of continuing education to those offices or staff labeled "continuing education or community services" may have reason to be skeptical about the force for change that represents. It is the accumulative strength of all the functions of the college that are CE characteristic or external in emphasis that represents that potential. The market responsive, access or outreach, community problem solving, customer preference, entrepreneurial orientation to services as found in non credit programming, business industry services, credit outreach, community literacy, distance learning, women's entry and many other college functions is that force for collegial action and change.

The degree to which these CE characteristic functions are centralized or coordinated among themselves will have bearing on how much team influence can be exerted with the rest of the college. Theoretically, the CE office that administers credit outreach, business industry services, distance learning or some like service combination

has more status and connection to influence general institutional change. A strong business industry operation of itself, may have good capacity to effect occupational programs, but little linkage with transfer studies. The CE office that has a conflict or lack of interest in fully representing credit and non credit options to the client is neither customer responsive or acting for the college as a whole.

Collectively considered, the information, ideas and connections that result from the experience of the field oriented staff are the powerhouse needed "to have community educational needs and problems flow back to impact the college curriculum" -"to link our faculty and the college with the real world" as advanced by Daie Parnell in a 1982 speech to the National Council on Community Services and continuing Education." Lest there be any gloating by CE people over that statement, Dr. Parnell also emphasized this as a "two way street". "The existing college credit curriculum can provide the basis for the continuing education program, in many instances".(3)

The value of CE personnel on this "two way street" is in their capacity for environmental scanning, resource development, market research, and community contacting that they perform in the natural course of their jobs. Presidents who do not look past the cash cow value of these staff may be sacrificing the more valuable long term service results that can be achieved by harnessing their collaborative potential. This is not to suggest that we start up offices of Institutional Transformation or tell the CE staff they are now performing as environmental scanners. Sure as hell, the way to kill off some ideas is to name them, staff them or assign them. Another caution is against making any moves that inhibit the entrepreneurial thrust of CE staff by over-internalizing them. We can pull them in from the cold, periodically, to serve larger interests of the college, but not let them get too cozy.

The sniping that often occurs between CE and campus based personnel regarding mission, quality, budget, enrollment competition and other issues is usually baseless. These staff do not examine each others activities closely enough to figure out where healthy or unhealthy competition, necessary or unnecessary duplication is occurring, if it were. While campus staff are muttering suspicions over CE instructional free-lancing,

mainly because they do not control it, the CE people think that by guarding trade secrets they are fending off de-centralization threats. What is lost in the standoff is the possibilities for quality improvement of their own products to say nothing of the possibilities for institutional improvement.

The following are some actual and conceptual examples of what can happen if CE and campus staff think together.

Actualizing the Learning Community

The learning community is the totality of individuals and organizations whose resources must be coalesced to bring wholism, currency and adaptability to the learning experience. As catalysts and scanners of change, continuing educators should become the learning leaders who with their campus, industrial, government, service agency and other counterparts, mobilize the collaboration needed to actualize the learning community. This will be the theme of the National Conference of the National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education in Denver, October of 1993.

Non Credit Programming

The department chair of the business management studies articulates with the non credit CE professional development program to award CE students completing those courses credit toward a business degree. The articulation is also extended to business-industry in-service activities in supervision in management. The CE program has new incentives to attract customers and work with industry. The campus credit program has a new student feeder market.

General Public Credit Outreach

Because of the increasing disproportion of part time to full time instructors, academic coordination between outreach centers, business and industry credit classes sites with the campus is eroded. Partnership agreements are drawn between CE outreach staff and campus department chairs to clarify who is responsible for the hiring, orientation, staff development, mentoring and evaluation of adjunct faculty. Faculty to faculty meetings are held in each discipline to establish where there is to be consistency

of teaching practices to achieve similar student outcomes in the same classes. Similarly, it is agreed where autonomy of instruction is supported.

Community Services

Presidents reading the demographic handwriting on the wall, as it relates to future enrollments and mission, may wish to reconsider the community service function. The revival of non profit learning and attendant services extended to the under-represented in the community will become a fundamental support for diversity success. Although this movement has implications for colleges to become more things to more people again, there may be a way to do it and still make strategic planners happy. In such programs as the Kellogg "Acclaim" project, "Cities in Schools", "Building Communities", the recognition that learning does not occur in isolation to support of other community and personal needs is being rediscovered.

Occupational Learning Systems

At many colleges, occupational faculty are not utilized as a primary source in industry-site, contract services. The reasons vary from the practical to the attitudinal. Without steady exposure in the business-industry setting, the institutional program can corrode. CE/BIS staff who distrust the currency of the campus program or for other reasons do not draw from faculty for outreach work, will eventually limit their own delivery resources. When they do not assist in building the home program, they risk losing market share in that occupational field.

Occupational clusters that adapt to today's demand will offer a continuum of learning services across the tech prep, job entry and retraining markets. To do so, they will have to have strong customized training, outreach, continuing education and distance learning capacity. Revenue gained from these enterprises can be applied to upgrading the occupational area. Instructors will work inter-changeably on campus and in industry. They will be trained in the customization process and in how to perform instruction in the industrial setting. There will be systematic applications of the Dacum or like processes, to maintain currency. Business-industry representatives will serve in advisory roles as

active monitors of the relevance of instruction offered. Faculty externships in industry will be a common practice.

CE staff will be a major source for reporting workforce trends, for new program development and to facilitate change in the institution to accommodate change in industrial standards. CE staff will market and manage off campus projects and share in the proceeds from them. In doing so, they will build capacity for those occupational areas to perform CE functions. They will monitor effectiveness of workforce learning services, advise on staff development needs, and assure industrial leadership is involved in curriculum direction. When CE staff can confidently market occupational learning in any form desired by the client, for initial on site retraining, the likelihood increases that those employee-students will cycle to the campus to take advantage of equipment, self paced learning and other resources that may be difficult to extend off campus. The workforce student who may initially receive non credit customized training may subsequently become a credit student. Thus, we have a dynamic wholistic system of administrators, instructors and students alike cross-learning in credit and non credit systems.

CE administrators, no less than academic administrators, will have to become learning leaders and institutional partnership leaders. In a time when we need to produce educated technicians and trained professionals, the debate over the importance of training or education has become academic. To serve the learner first, along with the college and client organizations, there must be understanding of the mix and match of assessment, general education, skill building and differing delivery processes that build individual learning capacity and fit organizational needs. The basic workplace skills defined by business leaders, the ASTD and DOL (3) cut extensively across the curriculum lines of what we have regarded as transfer studies. Retraining, often treated as the province of CE, BIS staff, cannot remain so without wasteful market overlap and the sacrifice of currency in campus occupational programs.

The college will always have new and distinct learning consumers to be reached inventively, by staff who think and do in CE fashion. Institutional staff will have the benefit of working in a more stabilized laboratory to validate learning principles. The learner will

be served when CE and institutional staff learn to share their vision of learning. The vision will hit the road when the colleges, of all places, learn how to enable staff to think together.

References

- 1) Senge, P.M., The Fifth Discipline, Dell Publishing, New York, 1990.
- 2) Teitel, L., The Transformation of a Community College, Community College Review, 1991.
- 3) Parnell, D., The Catalyst and Community Services and Continuing Education from 20 Years, The Catalyst, 1991.
- 4) Carnevale, A, L. Gainer, A. Meltzer, Workplace Basics, Jossey Bass, San Francisco, 1990.

AT&T DENVER WORKS-FRONT RANGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Industry-Education Partnerships

Collaborative Change Issues

- 1) Who will lead who? Will industry or education dictate change in what is to be learned, what student performance expectations should be, what faculty should know, what technology will require, what instruction, learning, delivery and design methods are to be employed?
- 2) Will industry's demand for increased program rigor and faster results, conflict with community college philosophy to nurture the learner or to accommodate the at risk learner?
- 3) How will colleges maintain currency with industry standards in face of decreased budgets for equipment, staff development?
- 4) Are industry education and the learner dedicated to the time and development needed to produce the adaptable, wholistic learner, as defined by workforce 2000?
- 5) How will we cope with faculty resistance to change?
- 6) Does faculty need special training to instruct at industry sites?
- 7) Is industry adequately orienting and motivating employees to what learning needs will be required and providing support activity to assist them to succeed at retraining? Are we doing the same with faculty?
- 8) Will the increase in the workforce of the older worker require new instructional approaches?
- 9) Is it imperative for instructors, in order to achieve currency in vocational programs, to consistently work in the industry setting?
- 10) How can specific vocational programs be designed to accommodate divergent skill level demands from employers (low tech to high tech) and support sufficient enrollments?
- 11) Is there more conflict or complement in designing curriculum which serves retraining, job entry, tech-prep and outreach markets?
- 12) Should the design of a campus program differ, if a significant proportion of the enrollments and delivery is to occur at industry sites?
- 13) Will industry place pressure on institutions to adopt curriculum that is too customized or specialized to serve general job placement and retraining needs?
- 14) Are your continuing education, business-industry service units working with campus programs in a true collaborative fashion, to effect curriculum and delivery change?
- 15) Should all effective vocational, literacy and other programs have strong entrepreneurial, outreach, customizing and continuing education capacity?
- 16) Are debates over what is education, what is training, or the relative merits of systems and content learning, more academic or more relevant than ever to prepare students for the workplace?
- 17) What are the advantages and pitfalls for general education to adapt curriculum to the needs of the workplace as a central purpose?